## Universal Basic Income CP

### FW

**The value is Morality- off the resolution implies a moral obligation**

#### A. Util is the only moral system available to policymakers.

Goodin 95’ Robert E. Goodin 95 professor of government at the University of Essex, and professor of philosophy and social and political theory at Australian National University, “Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Public Policy, May 1995 HSLA//SC  
Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are** relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public **policy-makers** to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

#### Public policy-makers must look at the util first because they act on behalf of a collective body.

Woller 97’ Gary, Brigham Young University, “A Forum On The Role of Environmental Ethics in Restructuring Environmental Policy and Law for the Next Century”, Policy Currents, 1997 HSLA//SC

Moreover, virtually all public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources, such that one group's gains must come at another group's ex- pense. Consequently, public **policies** in a democracy **must be justified to the public**, and especially to those who pay the costs of those policies. Such justification cannot simply be assumed a priori by invoking some higher-order moral principle. Appeals to a priori moral principles, such as environmental preservation, also often fail to acknowledge that public policies inevitably entail trade-offs among competing values. **Thus** since policymakers cannot justify inherent value conflicts to the public in any philosophical sense, and since public policies inherently imply winners and losers, **the policymakers' duty to the public** interest **requires them to demonstrate that the** redistributive **effects** and value trade-offs **implied by their polices are** somehow **to the overall advantage of society.** At the same time, deontologically based ethical systems have severe practical limitations as a basis for public policy. At best, apriorimoral principles provide only general guidance to ethical dilemmas in public affairs and do not themselves suggest appropriate public policies, and at worst, they create a regimen of regulatory unreasonableness while failing to adequately address the problem or actually making it worse.For example, a moral obligation to preserve the environment by no means implies the best way, or any way for that matter, to do so, just as there is no a priori reason to believe that any policy that claims to preserve the environment will actually do so. Any number of policies might work, and others, although seemingly consistent with the moral principle, will fail utterly. That deontological principles are an inadequate basis for environmental policy is evident in the rather significant irony that most forms of deontologically based environmental laws and regulations tend to be implemented in a very utilitarian manner by street-level enforcement officials. Moreover, ignoring the relevant costs and benefits of environmental policy and their attendant incentive structures can, as alluded to above, actually work at cross purposes to environmental preservation. (There exists an extensive literature on this aspect of regulatory enforcement and the often perverse outcomes of regulatory policy. See, for example, Ackerman, 1981; Bartrip and Fenn, 1983; Hawkins, 1983, 1984; Hawkins and Thomas, 1984.) Even the most die-hard preservationist/deontologist would, I believe, be troubled by this outcome. The above points are perhaps best expressed by Richard Flathman, The number of values typically involved in public policy decisions, the broad categories which must be employed and above all, the scope and complexity of the consequences to be anticipated militate against reasoning so conclusively that they generate an imperative to institute a specific policy. It is seldom the case that only one policy will meet the criteria of the public interest (1958, p. 12). It **therefore** follows that in a democracy, **policymakers have an ethical duty to establish a** plausible link between **policy alternative**s and the problems they address, **and the public must be** reasonably **assured that a policy will actually do something about an existing problem**; this requires the means-end language and methodology of utilitarian ethics. Good intentions, lofty rhetoric, and moral piety are an insufficient though perhaps at times a necessary, basis for public policy in a democracy.

**Thus, the standard is Maximizing well-being**

### A: Text

**The USFG will institute a Universal Basic Income for its citizens 18 years and older. The Current System of welfare and food stamps will phase out.**

### B: N/B

**Although it would be possible to implement a guaranteed right to housing and a UBI, it would be undesirable to do both of these plans.**

#### **1. UBI is cheaper than the current system**

**Worstall** **16’** Worstall, Tim. "Of Course We Can Afford A Universal Basic Income: Do We Want One Though?" Forbes. Forbes Magazine, 04 June 2016. Web. 05 Mar. 2017.

The UBI is to be financed by getting rid of Social[Security](http://www.forbes.com/security/), Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, Supplemental Security Income, housing subsidies, welfare for single women and every other kind of welfare and social-services program, as well as agricultural subsidies and corporate welfare. **As of 2014, the annual cost of a UBI would have been about $200 billion cheaper than the current system. By 2020, it would be nearly a trillion dollars cheaper. A UBI at this level is actually cheaper than the current system.**

The other two issues we get rid of are firstly, the minimum wage. **If everyone's getting a basic income then we don't have to ensure that wages create a basic income**. Thus involuntary unemployment will disappear. Simply **because there** always **will be jobs at some few dollars an hour if people do want to do a little bit of light work here and there to top up that UBI**. And no, we won't see people being taken advantage of: for the UBI actually raises the reservation wage. If you're already getting near $1,000 a month then the amount someone has to offer you to go to work rises, doesn't it? The **second** is that **we've just reduced the tax and benefits withdrawal rate for the poor.** Just as with the Laffer Curve argument about the rates of tax upon the rich (note that the Laffer Curve is true, the only argument is about where the rate is, not whether) it is also true that too high a marginal tax rate upon the poor will reduce the desire to work. The US does not suffer too much from this problem but my native UK definitely does. There's millions of poor people who face marginal tax rates over 60% if they work just a few more hours a week: some over 100%. This comes from the income tax system starting quite low and the various welfare benefits tapering out. The two together can combine to create those 60-100% marginal tax rates.

#### **2. National Service is expensive- added participants, training, and supply will cost the plan Billions.**

**Brennan et al** **12’** Brennan, Matthew S., and Kyle L. Upshaw. American Service: New National Service for the United States. Naval Postgraduate School, Dec. 2012, www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a573814.pdf.

In a January 2012 debate about whether AmeriCorps should be eliminated, Bandow took the position that not only should AmeriCorps be eliminated, but so should the CNCS. According to Bandow, the “critical question is not the cost-benefit ratio, but the opportunity cost of AmeriCorps funding.” As he went on to note, although “public service has a nice ring to it, **there is no reason to believe that a dollar spent on national service will yield more benefits than** an additional dollar spent on medical research, technological innovation, or any **other** number of private and **public purposes.**” According to one estimate**, a full national service program** would **cost between $20,000 and $30,000 per volunteer.** If you assume an average of four million high school graduates each year, **this would result in an annual program budget of $120 billion.** These cost estimates **include** direct **costs** such **as** “assembling, sorting (and sorting out), **allocating, training several million youth** in a unending manpower convo**y; as well as indirect costs such as: clothing, providing initial medical attention, insurance, law enforcement associated with such large numbers, housing, and periodic leave arrangements.”**

### C: Solvency

#### The counterplan reduces inequality and poverty

**Gibson 14** Carl Gibson (co-founder of US Uncut). “The Case for a Basic Guaranteed Income for All.” Huffington Post. May 13th, 2014. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carl-gibson/the-case-for-a-basic-guar\_b\_5311330.html

If you have to pay taxes for existing, you should be guaranteed a basic minimum income for surviving. It wouldn't amount to much, but **guaranteeing every American citizen** 18 and older **$1,000** per month, **or $12,000 a year**, is the most reasonable, practical, and **commonsense way to address** the **inequality** crisis that everyone in the country and most of the world is talking about right now. By all, I mean everyone over age 18, regardless of their current job and income situation. **It would be optional,** so those who already have fulfilling careers or make sufficient enough income to not need the extra $1,000 a month don't have to take it. Ideally, this basic guaranteed income for all would be **adjusted for inflation**, **and** would **phase in gradually while unemployment compensation and food stamps phase out. Other staples of the safety net**, like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, would still **remain**. And really, who could argue against this proposal? If we started our welfare spending over from scratch, and just went ahead and guaranteed everyone $1,000 a month, adjusted for inflation, **people in poverty would be** much **better off**. Especially given that Republicans in the House of Representatives continue to refuse an extension of unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed (and even refuse to hear stories of struggle from the unemployed), cut billions of dollars from food stamps (in a bipartisan bill), and continue to propose budgets that would rend all social safety nets to pieces in order for larger corporate welfare packages. Or that Senate Republicans who consistently approve "cost-of-living" raises for themselves still don't find it necessary to increase the minimum wage. What does **$1,000 a month**buy? It **can pay for a modest apartment** in the $600 to $700 range, a meager amount of **groceries,** provide enough to pay for **a basic phone plan, and** leave enough left over for **bus**/cab **fare**. It can't pay for high-end cars, flat screen TVs, condominiums, dining out for every meal or a cocaine habit. That amount of money is roughly the same amount of money one would get working a minimum wage job at part-time hours for a large corporation that only sees you as a tool to use for increasing its own profit margin. This means people working at fast food corporations like McDonalds would be able to quit their jobs and have enough to meet the most basic expenses, while looking for more fulfilling work, getting an education, starting their own businesses **and**otherwise **working toward their dreams**.  Conversely, if someone spends one third of a 24-hour day sleeping, and one third of the day working a job they hate that doesn't pay nearly enough to live on, that only leaves another eight hours for meeting all of their daily obligations, caring for their families, and finding ways to dig themselves out of wage slavery. Until we get a basic guaranteed income for all, a wide majority of Americans who are lucky enough to be employed will serve indefinite sentences of indentured servitude to immensely profitable and profoundly greedy fast food and retail robber barons.

#### UBI is k2 eliminating poverty and equality

**Wright** **00’** Wright, Erik Olin. “Reducing Income and Wealth Inequality: Real Utopian Proposals.” *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2000, pp. 143–156., www.jstor.org/stable/2654939.

**U**niversal **b**asic **i**ncome is likely to generate greater egalitarianism within labor markets. If workers are more able to refuse employment, wages for unpleasant work are likely to increase relative to wages for highly enjoy- able work. The wage structure in labor markets, therefore, will begin to reflect more systematically the relative disutility of different kinds of labor rather than simply the relative scarcity of different kinds of labor power. This, in turn, will generate an incentive structure for employers to seek technical innovations that eliminate unpleasant work. Technical change would therefore have not just a labor-saving bias, but a labor-humanizing bias. Third, universal basic income **directly and massively eliminates poverty** without creating the pathologies of means-tested antipoverty transfers. There is no stigmatization, since every- one gets the grant. **There is no well-defined boundary between net beneficiaries and net contributors**, since many people and families will move back and forth across this boundary over time. Thus, it is less likely that stable majority coalitions against redistribution will form once basic income has been in place for some length of time. **There are also no "poverty traps" caused by threshold effects for eligibility for transfers. Everyone gets the transfers unconditionally.** **If you work and earn wages, the additional income is taxed, of course; but the tax rate is progressive, so there is no disincentive for a person to enter the labor market to acquire discretionary income.**

### 